

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

September 12, 2002

Best Inn
Ellensburg, Washington

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
James Peters	Olympia
Brenda McMurray	Yakima
Steve Tharinger	Clallam County
Tim Smith	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Shari Schafflein	Designee, Department of Transportation
Ed Manary	Designee, Conservation Commission

Call to Order:

Chair Bill Ruckelshaus opened the meeting at 9:21 a.m.

The agenda was approved as presented.

Topic #1: Review and Approval of the SRFB Meeting Minutes

Chair Ruckelshaus asked for clarification on Brenda McMurray's comments under Topic #1 in the May 2002 minutes. Brenda clarified that what she meant in regards to one agreed-upon process referred to monitoring and the use of such tools as EDT, IFIM, etc. Chair asked Brenda to work with Tammy to revise this paragraph in the final minutes.

Steve Tharinger **moved** to accept the May 2002 and June 2002 meeting minutes, as revised. Brenda McMurray **seconded** the motion. **Approved** by the Board.

Topic #2: Management and Status Reports

Director's report: Laura Johnson gave an overview of SRFB's grants in the Ellensburg area.

Technical Panel Information – The Technical Panel will combine past panel members with new members, forming teams of two. Five members of the Panel (Carol Smith, Jeanette Smith, Steve Toth, Kate Terrell, and Kevin Bauersfeld) have returned to serve on the 4th Round grant cycle and seven new members have been added: Andy Loch, Rodney Sakrison, Rich Carlson, Scott Nicolai, Pat Klavas, Phil Leven (alternate Stephen Riley) and Jeff Dillon. There will also be a separate process and panel to review nearshore projects. Brenda would like the Board to consider the future of the Technical Panel. She would like to get guidance from this Technical Panel as well as

from past panel members to see what they believe needs to be done in future grant cycles. The Chair would like to provide the Technical Panel with questions from the Board at the October 1 briefing meeting. Bill asked Brenda to help frame the questions.

Tim Smith announced WDFW's new Lead Entity Coordinator is Brian Walsh, who will begin work on October 14.

Laura Johnson reported on Congressional inquiries from Senator Hollings following the May 14, 2002 hearing on the Boxer bill [S1825]. The states received follow-up questions about "accountability" for the federal salmon funds. Laura commented that the questions reflect Congress' need for proof of fiscal accountability (which we have provided) as well as for biological results which are harder to document – "Are there more fish now?". Some of the tools to help answer the 'results' question include the State of Salmon report and the SRFB report to the Legislature. Another idea is to sample SRFB's current projects, showing what we have learned from funded projects and what has been accomplished. Our state legislature will be asking the same questions so the Board will need to be able to answer these questions soon. Also pending before Congress is legislation to use the ESA Section 6 to provide funds for ESA salmon projects. This could be the first time that NOAA would use the Section 6 method for funding projects.

Chair Ruckelshaus noted that this is a subject that could be discussed for many more hours and that the Board needs to be aware of what congress means by accountability and be responsive to it. Jim Peters discussed fish health indicators for tracking of project results. Some of the information is already being collected. The one difficult thing to track is the education of the general public on salmon issues. The Chair feels we have a very good story to tell — it is just a matter of pulling the report together.

SRFB's budget request was due to the Office of Financial Management by Sept. 6. Debra Wilhelmi and staff did a great job submitting the budget to OFM by the deadline. SRFB requests included money for the technical panel, monitoring, and regional support.

The Chair thanked Laura for the list of litigation included in the notebook. He asked Laura to pull together a summary of pending litigation related to salmon and get it to the Board.

The Chair introduced Ed Manary as the new Conservation Commission representative and introduced the state Conservation Commission Chair, Lynn Brown, from Ellensburg.

Financial Report: Debra Wilhelmi presented the financial report. She gave an overview of the current financial status for the state. (See notebook for details.)

Project Management Report: Rollie Geppert presented this agenda item. Rollie introduced Tara Galuska, newest salmon project manager. (See notebook for details.)

The November meeting will include an update on the previously funded engineered log jam projects.

Topic #3: 2003 Planning and Meeting Schedule

Laura Johnson presented this agenda item. As the current 2003 schedule reflects, there will be three meetings to discuss the 5th Round process.

The Chair asked for a tentative agreement on the schedule. Brenda asked why the funding meeting was moved to May and questioned if Spokane was the best location for this meeting. Response: The May meeting, although not ideal, was the best date that could be identified due to other logistical issues. There was discussion about moving the May meeting to a more central location.

There was discussion on the need for the addition of a June meeting to review 4th Round and to finalize 5th Round issues.

The 2003 schedule was tentatively approved with final approval scheduled for the November meeting. Staff will change the location for the May 2003 meeting and look at dates for an additional meeting in June.

The goal is to get the 5th Round materials out mid-year or earlier.

Topic #4: GSRO Report

Steve Meyer was announced as the new GSRO director. Steve will be missed as a member of the SRFB but will continue to work with the Board as the director of the GSRO. He will begin his new duties on Monday, September 16.

Steve gave a quick overview of his vision for the GSRO and his duties.

Topic #5: LEAG Report

Jay Watson presented this agenda item. Jay gave an update on LEAG activities over the last couple months. They are putting together a committee to work with Debra Wilhelmi on PRISM usage by the lead entities. LEAG vision and 2514/2496 coordination efforts are other items LEAG is working on currently.

Next LEAG meeting is scheduled for October 3, 2002, at the Best Western Airport Executel in SeaTac, Washington.

Jay suggested Director Johnson work with Kristi Lynette to help identify successful salmon projects. The lead entities are working to pull this information together and Kristi is the lead on this effort as well as facilitator, Jagoda Perich-Anderson.

LEAG is working on a vision paper for the overall SRFB grant process including a lead entity certification aspect. They aren't ready to present this to the Board yet but plan to in the near future.

The Chair encouraged LEAG to work on its vision but to be aware of the SRFB's mission and that direction also needs to be included in the vision.

Topic #7: Programmatic Grants Process

Jim Fox presented this agenda item. (See notebook for details.) The Board is sometimes asked to provide funding outside of its annual grant cycle. The Board adopted policies for funding programs and activities at the November and December 1999 Board meetings (see notebook for Attachment B - "Policies Approved at the November 17th and December 3rd 1999 Meetings to Guide Funding of Programs and Activities"). However, these policies have not been revisited recently and currently there is no established process for the Board to respond to future requests for funding.

Board Discussion:

Ed Manary noted that with current budget troubles, this issue is not going to go away. There is a need to know what the ground rules are to bringing requests before the Board. The Board also needs to make sure the legislature is aware of this situation and process. He questioned whether Attachment B is still pertinent. It seems that there may be a few conflicts between the memo and Attachment B.

The Chair believes that the legislature does need to understand this issue and hopes the response to the Governor's request letter to Russ Cahill, Bill Ruckelshaus, and Curt Smitch (now Steve Meyer) will answer some of the questions and alleviate the need for state agency program funding to be brought before the SRFB.

Brenda McMurray agreed with the Chair's comments. She appreciates Jim Fox's work in pulling all the previous work together into one memorandum. She would like to see the same rigor on any programmatic funding the Board accepts. A multi-agency review will need to be used to evaluate programmatic requests. She would like to see the Board avoid "emergency" requests.

Jim Peters cautioned the Board that it needs to be careful about this type of funding. Need to make the state legislature responsible and not let the Board be a scapegoat in the decision-making. The legislature needs to start funding the natural resources programs and agencies. Also agrees that the Board needs to be cautious with the "emergency" requests. If there are emergency requests, they would need to go through the same review as other requests go through.

Craig Partridge discussed the need for a clearer statewide strategy and addressing the role of the Independent Science Panel (ISP). He agrees with Mr. Manary in that the Board will not be able to ignore this issue. Craig didn't see eligibility requirements in Jim's memo. The Board needs to identify who can bring projects to the Board for possible funding.

Ed Manary noted there may be different criteria for different types of projects. It is imperative the Board address the issue and communicate it to the stakeholders, including the state legislature.

Tim Smith noted that WDFW is uncomfortable competing for programmatic funds out of project funds.

The Chair agrees that a more orderly process for considering requests for funding is warranted. There is a need to revisit this issue in the future to develop a more

streamlined process. The Chair doesn't feel an Interdisciplinary Review Panel is necessary.

Public Testimony:

Gary Wood, Forage Fish Project Coordinator – Discussed the nearshore project as an example. This project consists of nine different projects that all went through the lead entity process and then became a coordinated project. Another project that he is involved with is the derelict gear project, a project that has one coordinator from the beginning of the project and is regionally based. He suggested having the same screening for both types of projects, both lead entity based and regional projects. He supports Option 2B with one panel that looks at both types of projects.

The Chair agreed that the programmatic process needs to address the different projects.

Brenda McMurray would like to have the Board move forward with this topic and would like the subject on the November agenda.

Topic #6: Small Grants Round Options

Jim Fox presented this agenda item for discussion. (See notebook for details.)

Sponsors of small habitat restoration projects find the lead entity and SRFB process too demanding and time consuming to justify applying to the Board for funding.

A memorandum has been circulated to the lead entities, a copy of which can be found in the notebook. Four comments were received. All supported a small grant process, where the application and evaluation process would be simplified and streamlined, but made other suggestions to help with development of the final process. At this point staff is not ready to present the Board with a recommendation.

Jim Fox presented the four options to the Board:

1. Ask SRFB staff to investigate the need for a small grant program and develop several models for meeting the need. Staff would invite public comment on the results, which would be presented to the Board at the November Board meeting for possible action.
2. Accept the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation offer to submit a formal request to the SRFB at the November Board meeting. The Board could ask them to document the need for such a program as part of the request. By November we should know the level of Federal funds that will be available and therefore the amount of funding available for the Fourth Round and other funding requests. The Board would make a decision based on the written proposal, the applicant's presentation to the Board, and any public comment received, including testimony at the meeting.
3. Announce an open invitation for agencies and organizations to submit proposals for a small grant program to the Board at the November meeting. There could be agencies and organizations besides NFWF with access to other funding that would like to present a proposal. The SRFB could choose to fund more than one proposal.
4. Defer any decision about a small grant program until spring of 2003. The issue

would be included in fall and winter discussions about future SRFB grant programs.

Board Discussion:

Jim Peters asked how the Board would try to streamline the current process and still keep the current checks and balances in place? Response: That is a key question and the key criteria will need to be determined no matter what process the Board uses.

Brenda McMurray believes there are bigger issues that the Board should be addressing before developing a small grant process. She believes some of the small projects could be folded into a bigger process.

The Chair asked if there are needs that aren't being met. Is the Board missing significant benefits to the salmon as a result of not meeting the needs of smaller grants? These are the first two questions that need to be answered before determining if there is a need for an additional process. How are volunteers used in the state? There are many volunteer efforts going on in Washington and in other states that are very effective in helping with the environment and fish recovery.

Public Testimony:

Krystyna Wolniakowski, director for the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Northwest Region, and Dennis Canty, president Evergreen Funding Consultants – Dennis noted that his group identifies funding sources for funding salmon recovery projects. He finds much need for small-scale projects that include a public support element. Finds some of the small-scale projects are having a problem with the SRFB process because of its level of scrutiny and competitiveness of the process. In helping clients fill out applications, he finds it takes 30 to 50 hours to complete the application process. This should be done for larger-scale projects but not for small scale tree planting or other small-scale projects. The NFWF funds small-scale projects following five criteria:

1. Streamlined application process – 1 page form preapplication – takes no more than 10 hours of the applicant's time
2. Outreach and support to potential applicants
3. Strong connections with the lead entities
4. Substantial benefit to salmon – stringent technical review
5. Generous cost-share terms – 50/50 cost share

Working with NFWF, he has found this to be a very good organization and would highly recommend them as a partner if the Board pursues the development of a small grants program.

Krystyna Wolniakowski gave an overview of how the NFWF system works, and how they process applications. Although it is not required to coordinate with the SRFB, her goal is to follow the Washington State Strategy. Grants range from \$4,000 – \$1 million. Most are less than \$80,000. Besides the scientific integrity of the project, NFWF looks at the community aspect of the grant. They have three grant cycles each year. She would once again be willing to link up with the SRFB on funding projects to better leverage both NFWF and SRFB funds.

Craig Partridge asked if the projects NFWF funds are the same types of projects that

the SRFB funds or different types of projects.

Response: Same type of projects although usually at a smaller scale. They do fund education and outreach projects that the SRFB doesn't currently fund.

Jeff Breckel, Executive Director, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board – Would like the SRFB to look at an option to fund smaller scale projects. He has heard from many constituents that the SRFB process is too onerous, detailed, and time consuming for the small-scale project proponents. He suggests having staff gather more information on actual need. He has a question on whether a streamlined process may be appropriate for some types of projects. Building landowner support is important and small-scale projects help to provide this education and outreach.

Ms. McMurray asked if the lead entities are getting project lists together that could be funded out of other funding sources or just out of the SRFB funds.

Response: The LCFRB would like to have this option in the future but it is several years from becoming a reality.

The Chair recommended that staff conduct a needs assessment, including community benefits and potential partnerships, to determine whether needs are currently being met and where the gaps are and bring the results back to the Board at a later time.

Topic #8: Regions – Status and Goals

Report on Current 2496/2514 Coordination - Tim Smith, WDFW, introduced Sara LaBorde, Special Assistant to the Director on salmon recovery, who presented this topic. Hedia Adelsman represented Ecology during this presentation. (See notebook and handout for details.) Information was presented on the level of coordination between watershed planning and salmon restoration project development occurring in water-critical basins.

Brenda McMurray asked about timing for the cross-coordination between 2514 and 2496 groups. Response: Not determined at this time.

Northwest Power Planning Council Overview of Subbasin Planning Process – Tony Grover, NWPPC staff, presented this agenda item. (See handout for details.) Information was presented on what a Subbasin Planning Process is and how it fits in with salmon recovery.

Brenda McMurray asked about the NWPPC budget for Subbasin planning. Response: \$5.1 million in total for Washington.

Shari Schaftlein asked if there is an outline of what the interim plans should look like and what the final plans will include? Response: Yes, there is an outline but still don't know what the final plan will look like. The NWPPC is still working to get the individual work plans.

Overview of Regional Boards – Jeff Breckel, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board, introduced the panel consisting of – Jim Kramer (Puget Sound Recovery Region), Teresa Ryan (Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board), Steve Martin (Snake River

Salmon Recovery Board), Sara LaBorde (WDFW), Bob Bugert (GSRO), Elizabeth Garr (NMFS), Tony Grover (NWPPC), and Leo Bowman (Yakima River Salmon Planning Board). See handout for details.

Benton County Commissioner Leo Bowman was welcomed to the meeting. Bowman provided a short overview of the Regional Recovery Boards and the Yakima process now underway.

Elizabeth Garr, NMFS, reported on NOAA Fisheries' perspectives on the Regional Recovery Boards. NMFS has a legal mandate to develop ESA recovery plans. The plans need to have common goals and common outcomes to have accountability. Recovery plans are required to have site specific actions, which is hard to see at the ESU level so need the assistance/input from the local entities. Goal is to have completed recovery plans by 2005.

Bob Bugert, GSRO – Reviewed Regional Salmon Organization Support Issue Paper. (See handout for details.)

Sara LaBorde gave the WDFW perspective on the Regional Boards.

Steve Martin (Snake River) talked about funding and technical staff support and also gave an overview of the Snake River Regional Fish Recovery Board.

Jim Kramer (Puget Sound Shared Strategy) noted the needs listed in the white paper. Jim noted that there are three types of funding needs:

- Support for the Regional Boards for a longer time than currently provided;
- Continued funding at the watershed level (Lead Entities, 2514, 2496, and other existing efforts);
- Continued funding for projects.

The regional boards also need technical support and common databases.

The Panel and Board discussed regional recovery needs. There was agreement this will take funding, coordination, and support at the local, as well as state and federal levels.

Topic #9: Upper Columbia Request

Teresa Ryan, UCSRB, and Ron Walter, UCSRB vice-chair and Chelan County Commissioner, presented this item, requesting an additional \$181,000 for the Upper Columbia Regional Recovery Planning Grant for the 2002-03 fiscal year.

Board Discussion:

Brenda McMurray asked where WDFW is on distributing the \$1 million in regional funding. Response: They have received more than 1 million dollars worth of proposals for the funding and \$500,000 has yet to be disbursed.

Jim Peters made a **motion** to approve Resolution #2002-13. Brenda McMurray **seconded** the motion. **Approved** by the Board.

Jim Peters still has concern with the cost of communications in this proposal. He

supports the need for outreach, but believes there is a need to be accountable.

Topic #10: Nearshore Area Grants Criteria

Tim Smith, WDFW, presented this agenda item. (See handout for details.)

Tim reported that the Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project continues to move forward on schedule. An initial draft of the “Guidance for the Identification of Salmon Recovery Projects in the Nearshore” is nearing completion with the document going to Lead Entities and Marine Resource Committees in December. The guidance document and also the “Criteria for the Evaluation of Salmon Recovery Projects in the Nearshore” document will be presented to the Board in final draft in April, in time for use in the 2003 SRFB funding cycle. The Nearshore Science Team continues to develop and refine the technical tools that will lead to priority restoration and protection projects in Puget Sound’s nearshore environment.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

SRFB APPROVAL:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair

Date

Future Meetings: November 14, 2002 – Olympia

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD
RESOLUTION #2002-13

FUNDING THE UPPER COLUMBIA FISH RECOVERY BOARD

WHEREAS, at the February 7 & 8, 2002, SRFB meeting \$2 million in funding was granted to the four recovery regions and the Hood Canal Coordinating Council; and

WHEREAS, the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board (UCFRB) received \$300,000 of this money; and

WHEREAS, the UCSRB has accomplished several tasks through dedicated efforts of many people and organizations; and

WHEREAS, additional funding is critical to maintain the momentum achieved through the UCSRB planning process. Since the UCSRB is now seeking a much wider public discourse on salmon recovery, finalizing and implementing operational public outreach and community strategies will be key components to the success of these efforts.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the SRFB provides an additional \$181,000 grant to the Upper Columbia Salmon Recovery Board for the 2002-03 fiscal year; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the SRFB sees this action as an opportunity to increase the coordination between the public, the lead entity (watershed) and the regional recovery group in providing complementary, consistent and coordinated services in the Upper Columbia Region.

Moved: _____ Jim Peters _____

Seconded: _____ Brenda McMurray _____

MOTION CARRIED / FAILED

Date: _____ September 12, 2002 _____